arXiv:1703.10582v1 [math.NT] 30 Mar 2017

# LARGE SUMS OF HECKE EIGENVALUES OF HOLOMORPHIC CUSP FORMS

YOUNESS LAMZOURI

Abstract. Let $f$ be a Hecke cusp form of weight $k$ for the full modular group, and let $\{\lambda_f(n)\}_{n\geq 1}$ be the sequence of its normalized Fourier coefficients. Motivated by the problem of the first sign change of $\lambda_f(n)$, we investigate the range of $x$ (in terms of $k$) for which there are cancellations in the sum $S_f(x)=\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)$. We first show that $S_f(x)=o(x\log x)$ implies that $\lambda_f(n)<0$ for some $n\leq x$. We also prove that $S_f(x)=o(x\log x)$ in the range $\log x/\log\log k\to\infty$ assuming the Riemann hypothesis for $L(s,f)$, and furthermore that this range is best possible unconditionally. More precisely, we establish the existence of many Hecke cusp forms $f$ of large weight $k$, for which $S_f(x)\gg_A x\log x$, when $x=(\log k)^A$. Our results are $GL_2$ analogues of work of Granville and Soundararajan for character sums, and could also be generalized to other families of automorphic forms.

## 1. Introduction

Let $k$ be a positive even integer, and denote by $\mathcal{H}_k$ the set of Hecke cusp forms of weight $k$ for the full modular group $\Gamma=SL(2,\mathbb{Z})$. Then, $\mathcal{H}_k$ is an orthonormal basis for the space of holomorphic cusp forms of weight $k$ for $\Gamma$ and we have

$$|\mathcal{H}_k|=\frac{k}{12}+O\left(k^{2/3}\right).$$

Given $f\in\mathcal{H}_k$, its Fourier expansion can be written in the form

$$f(z)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\lambda_f(n)n^{(k-1)/2}e(nz),\quad \text{for}\quad \mathrm{Im}(z)>0,$$

where $e(z)=e^{2\pi iz}$. The $\lambda_f(n)$ are the normalized eigenvalues of the Hecke operators $T_n$, and satisfy the well-known Hecke relations:

$$\lambda_f(m)\lambda_f(n)=\sum_{d|(m,n)}\lambda_f\left(\frac{mn}{d^2}\right), \tag{1.1}$$

for all $m,n\geq 1$. In particular, $\lambda_f$ is a real-valued multiplicative function of $n$. Moreover, it also satisfies the following deep bound due to Deligne

$$|\lambda_f(n)|\leq\tau(n), \tag{1.2}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11F30.

The author is partially supported by a Discovery Grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

where $\tau$ is the divisor function. These facts are standard and may be found for example in Chapter 14 of [8].

In [9], Kowalski, Lau, Soundararajan and Wu studied the signs of the sequence $\lambda_f(n)$. Their results show a strong analogy between these signs and the values of quadratic Dirichlet characters, and especially between the first negative Fourier coefficient and the problem of the least quadratic non-residue, which has a long history in analytic number theory. Let $n_f$ be the smallest positive integer $n$ such that $\lambda_f(n) < 0$. The best known bound for $n_f$ is due to Matomäki [12], who improved the authors of [9] by showing that

$$n_f \ll k^{3/4}.$$

This is probably far from the truth, since it is known that $n_f \ll (\log k)^2$ under the assumption of the generalized Riemann hypothesis (GRH). In the other direction, Theorem 3 of [9] shows that $n_f \gg \sqrt{\log k}$ for many Hecke cusp forms $f$ of weight $k$. A folklore conjecture asserts that the correct order of magnitude for the maximal values of $n_f$ should be $(\log k)^{1+o(1)}$.

In this paper, we explore $GL_2$ analogues of certain classical problems concerning short character sums and the least quadratic non-residue. More precisely, we investigate the size of the short sum of Hecke eigenvalues

$$S_f(x) := \sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n),$$

and its relation to the first negative Fourier coefficient of $f$. Our results are inspired by the work of Granville and Soundararajan [4] on character sums. In particular, Corollaries 1.2 and 1.4 below can be regarded as $GL_2$ analogues of Corollary A of [4].

Using Deligne's bound (1.2), one obtains the "trivial" bound

$$\big|S_f(x)\big| \leq \sum_{n\leq x} \tau(n) = (1+o(1))x\log x.$$

Our first result shows that if $S_f(x)$ is substantially smaller than this bound, namely that

$$S_f(x) = o(x\log x) \qquad (\text{as } x, k\to\infty), \tag{1.3}$$

then we must have $n_f \leq x$. The proof relies on an argument of Kowalski, Lau, Soundararajan and Wu [9], together with a nice result of Hildebrand [6] concerning quantitative lower bounds for mean values of non-negative multiplicative functions.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $f\in \mathcal{H}_k$. Let $x\geq 2$ and assume that $\lambda_f(n)\geq 0$ for all $n\leq x$. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n) \geq c_0 x\log x,$$

*for some absolute constant $c_0 > 0$.*

Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$. The $L$-function attached to $f$ is defined by

$$L(s,f) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_f(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{e^{i\theta_f(p)}}{p}\right)^{-1} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{e^{-i\theta_f(p)}}{p}\right)^{-1}, \text{ for } \mathrm{Re}(s) > 1, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\theta_f(p) \in [0,\pi]$. It is known that $L(s,f)$ extends analytically to the entire complex plane, and satisfies a functional equation that relates $L(s,f)$ to $L(1-s,f)$ (see for example Section 5.11 of [8]). A standard application of Perron's formula together with the convexity bound for $L(s,f)$ imply that

$$S_f(x) \ll x^{1/2+\varepsilon} \cdot k^{1/2+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.5}$$

and hence one has $S_f(x) = o(x \log x)$ in the range $x \geq k^{1+\varepsilon}$. This range can be improved to $x \geq k^{1-\delta}$, for some $\delta > 0$, by using subconvexity bounds for $L(s,f)$ (see for example [13]). Furthermore, assuming GRH for $L(s,f)$ one has the much stronger bound

$$S_f(x) \ll x^{1/2+\varepsilon} \exp\left(c_1 \frac{\log k}{\log\log k}\right), \tag{1.6}$$

for some absolute constant $c_1 > 0$. This shows that (1.3) is valid in the larger range

$$x \geq \exp\left(c_2 \frac{\log k}{\log\log k}\right)$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$, conditionally on the GRH. Exploiting an idea of Montgomery and Vaughan [14], we substantially improve this range under the assumption of GRH.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$, and assume GRH for $L(s,f)$. In the range $\log x/\log\log k \to \infty$, we have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_f(n) = o(x \log x).$$

We shall deduce this result from the following theorem, which shows that under GRH, we can approximate $S_f(x)$ by the corresponding sum of $\lambda_f(n)$ over *friable* (or smooth) numbers $n$, which are positive integers having only small prime factors. A positive integer $n$ is said to be $y$-friable if $P(n) \leq y$, where $P(n)$ denotes the largest prime factor of $n$, with the standard convention $P(1) = 1$.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$, and assume GRH for $L(s,f)$. Then, for all real numbers $x, y$ such that $(\log k)^2(\log\log k)^8 \leq y \leq x \leq k$ we have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_f(n) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P(n) \leq y}} \lambda_f(n) + O\left(\frac{(\log k)(\log y)^4}{\sqrt{y}} x \log x\right).$$

For an arithmetic function $g$, we define

$$\Psi(x,y;g) := \sum_{\substack{n\leq x\\ P(n)\leq y}} g(n).$$

The asymptotic behaviour of $\Psi(x,y;g)$ was investigated for a large class of multiplicative functions $g$ by several authors, and notably by Tenenbaum and Wu [18]. When $g$ is the divisor function $\tau$, de Bruijn and van Lint [1] proved that there exists a differentiable function $\rho_2 : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\Psi(x,y;\tau) \sim \rho_2(u)\cdot x\log y, \text{ where } u := \frac{\log x}{\log y}, \tag{1.7}$$

in the range $u \ll 1$. The function $\rho_2$ is defined by the differential-difference equation

$$u\rho_2'(u) = \rho_2(u) - 2\rho_2(u-1), \tag{1.8}$$

subject to the initial condition $\rho_2(u) = u$ for $0 \leq u \leq 1$. It is known that $\rho_2(u) > 0$ for any $u > 0$ and that $\rho_2(u) = u^{-u(1+o(1))}$ for large $u$ (see for example [5]). In fact, $\rho_2$ is the square convolution of the standard Dickman-de Bruijn function $\rho$, which appears in the asymptotic formula for the counting function of friable integers. The range of validity of the asymptotic formula (1.7) was improved to $u \leq \exp\left((\log y)^{3/5-\varepsilon}\right)$ by Smida [16], and hence in this range we have

$$\Psi(x,y;\lambda_f) \leq \Psi(x,y;\tau) \ll u^{-u(1+o(1))}x\log x,$$

by (1.2). For our purposes, it is enough to use the following weaker bound that holds uniformly for $10 \leq y \leq x$ (see Lemma 4.3 below)

$$\Psi(x,y;\tau) \ll e^{-u/2}x\log x. \tag{1.9}$$

Combining this bound with Theorem 1.3 imply Corollary 1.2.

We now investigate the largest range of $x$ (in terms of $k$) for which one has

$$S_f(x) \gg x\log x. \tag{1.10}$$

Recall that $n_f \gg \sqrt{\log k}$ for many Hecke cusp forms $f$ of weight $k$ by Theorem 3 of [9]. In view of Theorem 1.1, this shows that (1.10) is valid for such $f$ with $x = \sqrt{\log k}$. On the other hand, since $n_f \ll (\log k)^2$ on GRH, one might guess that (1.10) does not hold in the range $x \gg (\log k)^{2+\varepsilon}$. We prove that this is not the case, by showing that for any $A > 1$, there are many Hecke cusp forms $f$ of weight $k$ such that (1.10) holds for $x = (\log k)^A$. This shows that the range of Corollary 1.2 is best possible, and that conditionally on GRH the converse of Theorem 1.1 does not hold.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let $k$ be a large even integer. Let $A > 1$ be fixed, and $x = (\log k)^A$. There are at least $k^{1-1/\log\log k}$ Hecke cusp forms $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that*

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n) \gg_A x \log x.$$

We shall deduce this result from the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let $k$ be a large even integer. Let $A > 1$ be fixed, $y = \log k/\log\log k$ and $x = (\log k)^A$. There are at least $k^{1-1/\log\log k}$ Hecke cusp forms $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that*

$$\left|\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n)\right| \geq \Psi(x, y; \tau)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log\log k}}\right)\right).$$

The key idea in the proof of Theorem 1.5 is to compare large moments of $S_f(x)$ (as $f$ varies in $\mathcal{H}_k$) with those of a corresponding probabilistic random model. This model was introduced by Cogdell and Michel in [2] to study the complex moments of symmetric power $L$-functions at $s = 1$, and was subsequently used by various authors (see for example [10] and [11]) to explore similar problems. To describe this probabilistic model we consider the compact group $G = SU(2)$ endowed with its natural Haar measure $\mu_G$; we then let $G^\natural$ be the set of conjugacy classes of $G$ endowed with the Sato-Tate measure $\mu_{st}$ (i.e. the direct image of $\mu_G$ by the canonical projection). Let $\{g_p^\natural\}_{p \text{ prime}}$ be a sequence of independent random variables, with values in $G^\natural$ and distributed according to the measure $\mu_{st}$. We construct the sequence of random variables $\{\mathbb{X}(n)\}_{n\geq 1}$ by first defining

$$\mathbb{X}(p^a) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{Sym}^a\left(g_p^\natural\right)\right)$$

for a prime $p$ and a positive integer $a$, where $\operatorname{Sym}^a$ is the symmetric $a$-th power representation of the standard representation of $GL_2$. We then extend the $\mathbb{X}(p^a)$ multiplicatively by letting $\mathbb{X}(1) = 1$ and

$$\mathbb{X}(n) = \mathbb{X}(p_1^{a_1}) \cdots \mathbb{X}(p_\ell)^{a_\ell}$$

if the prime factorization of $n$ is $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_\ell^{a_\ell}$. We shall explore this probabilistic model and the motivation behind it in details in Section 3. Using the Petersson trace formula (see Lemma 3.1 below), we show that in a certain range of $x$, large (weighted) moments of $S_f(x)$ are very close to those of the sum of random variables $\sum_{n\leq x} \mathbb{X}(n)$. We then estimate the moments of this sum by first restricting the random variables $\mathbb{X}(n)$ to those indexed by $y$-friable integers $n$, and then controlling these by restricting the range of the random variables $\mathbb{X}(p)$ for the primes $p \leq y$.

Our approach is flexible and could be further generalized to obtain similar results for other families of automorphic forms. In particular, our results hold *mutatis mutandis* for primitive Hecke cusp forms of weight 2 and prime level $q$ (in the level aspect), with

the extra condition that $x < q$ in Theorem 1.1. One should also obtain the analogues of Theorems 1.3 and 1.5 for Fourier coefficients of the symmetric square and other symmetric power $L$-functions attached to primitive Hecke cusp forms, assuming their automorphy.

## 2. The size of $S_f(x)$ and the first negative Hecke eigenvalue: Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $p$ be a prime number. It follows from (1.4) that $\lambda_f(p) = 2\cos\theta_f(p)$ and more generally we have

$$\lambda_f(p^b) = \frac{\sin((b+1)\theta_f(p))}{\sin\theta_f(p)},$$

for any integer $b \geq 0$, by the Hecke relations (1.1).

Let $\alpha : [0,1] \to [-2,2]$ be defined by $\alpha(0) = 2$ and $\alpha(t) = 2\cos(\pi/(m+1))$ if $1/(m+1) < t \leq 1/m$, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For $x \geq 2$, let $h_x$ be the multiplicative function supported on square-free numbers and defined on the primes by

$$h_x(p) = \begin{cases} \alpha\left(\frac{\log p}{\log x}\right) & \text{if } p \leq x, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By exploiting the Hecke relations (1.1), we obtain the following lemma which is essentially proved in [9].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Let $x \geq 2$ be such that $\lambda_f(n) \geq 0$ for all $n \leq x$. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n) \geq \sum_{n\leq x} h_x(n).$$

*Proof.* By our assumption we have

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n) \geq \sum_{n\leq x}^{\flat} \lambda_f(n),$$

where $\sum^{\flat}$ restricts the summation to squarefree integers. Since $h_x(n) \geq 0$ for all squarefree $n$, it thus suffices to show that $\lambda_f(p) \geq h_x(p)$ for all primes $p \leq x$. Let $p \leq x$ be a prime number, and $m \geq 1$ be such that $x^{1/(m+1)} < p \leq x^{1/m}$. Then, for all integers $1 \leq j \leq m$ we have

$$0 \leq \lambda_f(p^j) = \frac{\sin((j+1)\theta_f(p))}{\sin\theta_f(p)}.$$

This implies $0 \leq \theta_f(p) \leq \pi/(m+1)$ and hence that

$$\lambda_f(p) = 2\cos\theta_f(p) \geq h_x(p),$$

as desired. □

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need to obtain a lower bound for $\sum_{n\leq x} h_x(n)$. We prove the following result.

**Proposition 2.2.** *There is an absolute constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for all large $x$ we have*

$$\sum_{n\leq x} h_x(n) \geq c_0 x \log x.$$

Combining this result with Lemma 2.1 imply Theorem 1.1. In order to prove Proposition 2.2, we shall use the following theorem of Hildebrand [6] which provides quantitative lower bounds for mean values of certain non-negative multiplicative functions.

**Theorem 2.3** (Theorem 2 of [6])**.** *Let $2 \leq z \leq x$ be real numbers. Let $g$ be a multiplicative function supported on squarefree numbers, such that $0 \leq g(p) \leq K$ for some constant $K \geq 1$ and all primes $p$. Then, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{x}\sum_{n\leq x} g(n) \geq & \frac{e^{-\gamma(K-1)}}{\Gamma(K)} \prod_{p\leq x}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)\left(1+\frac{g(p)}{p}\right) \\ & \times \left\{\sigma\left(\exp\left(\sum_{z\leq p\leq x}\frac{(1-g(p))^+}{p}\right)\right)\left(1+O\left(\frac{\log^\beta z}{\log^\beta x}\right)\right)+O\left(e^{-\left(\frac{\log x}{\log z}\right)^\beta}\right)\right\},\end{aligned}$$

*where $\gamma$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant, $y^+ = \max\{y, 0\}$, $\beta > 0$ is an absolute constant, and $\sigma(u)$ is a continuously differentiable function of $u \geq 1$ that satisfies $\sigma(u) \gg u^{-u}$. Furthermore, the implicit constants in the $O$-terms depend on $K$ only.*

We also need the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let $x$ be large. Then, we have*

$$\sum_{p\leq x}\frac{h_x(p)}{p} = 2\log\log x + O(1).$$

*Proof.* First, note that

$$\sum_{p\leq x}\frac{h_x(p)}{p} = \sum_{1\leq m\leq \frac{\log x}{\log 2}} 2\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right) \sum_{x^{1/(m+1)}\leq p<x^{1/m}}\frac{1}{p}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $M < \sqrt{\log x}$ be a large positive integer to be chosen later. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \sum_{m\leq M}\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right)\sum_{x^{1/(m+1)}\leq p<x^{1/m}}\frac{1}{p} \\ = & \sum_{m\leq M}\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right)\left(\log\left(\frac{m+1}{m}\right)+O\left(\frac{1}{\log(x^{1/(m+1)})}\right)\right) \qquad (2.2) \\ = & \sum_{m\leq M}\left(\frac{1}{m}+O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right)\right)+O\left(\frac{M^2}{\log x}\right) = \log M + O(1).\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

(2.3)
$$\sum_{M<m\leq \frac{\log x}{\log 2}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m+1}\right) \sum_{x^{1/(m+1)}\leq p<x^{1/m}} \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{M<m\leq \frac{\log x}{\log 2}} \left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right)\right) \sum_{x^{1/(m+1)}\leq p<x^{1/m}} \frac{1}{p}$$
$$= \left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{M^2}\right)\right) \sum_{p<x^{1/(M+1)}} \frac{1}{p}$$
$$= \log\log x - \log M + O\left(\frac{\log\log x}{M^2}+1\right).$$

Choosing $M=[\log\log x]$, and inserting the estimates (2.2) and (2.3) in (2.1) completes the proof. □

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Note that $h_x(p)<1$ if and only if $p>x^{1/2}$. Therefore, for all $z\leq x^{1/2}$ we have

$$\sum_{z\leq p\leq x} \frac{(1-h_x(p))^+}{p} = \sum_{x^{1/2}<p\leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \log 2 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right).$$

Thus, choosing $K=z=2$ in Theorem 2.3 we obtain that

$$\sum_{n\leq x} h_x(n) \geq \left(e^{-2\gamma}\sigma(2)+o(1)\right)\frac{x}{\log x}\prod_{p\leq x}\left(1+\frac{h_x(p)}{p}\right).$$

The result follows from Lemma 2.4. □

## 3. Large sums of Hecke eigenvalues : proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4

In order to prove Theorem 1.5, we shall compute the moments of $S_f(x)$ as $f$ varies in $\mathcal{H}_k$. When so doing, we shall use the *harmonic weights* that arise naturally in the Petersson trace formula (see Lemma 3.1 below). The harmonic weight of $f\in\mathcal{H}_k$ is defined by

$$\omega_f = \frac{\Gamma(k-1)}{(4\pi)^{k-1}\langle f,f\rangle} = \frac{2\pi^2}{(k-1)L(1,\mathrm{Sym}^2 f)},$$

where $\langle f,f\rangle$ is the Petersson inner product, and $L(s,\mathrm{Sym}^2 f)$ is the symmetric square $L$-function of $f$. Given a sequence $(\alpha_f)_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}$, its harmonic average is defined as the sum

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h} \alpha_f = \sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k} \omega_f\alpha_f,$$

and if $S\subset\mathcal{H}_k$ we will let $|S|_h$ denote the harmonic measure of $S$, that is

$$|S|_h := \sum_{f\in S}^{h} 1.$$

Moreover, the classical estimate

$$|\mathcal{H}_k|_h = 1 + O\left(k^{-5/6}\right), \tag{3.1}$$

together with the bounds of Goldfeld, Hoffstein and Liemann (see the Appendix of [7])

$$\frac{1}{k\log k} \ll \omega_f \ll \frac{\log k}{k}, \tag{3.2}$$

show that the harmonic weight $\omega_f$ is close to the natural weight $1/|\mathcal{H}_k|$ (since $|\mathcal{H}_k| \asymp k$), and it defines asymptotically a probability measure on $\mathcal{H}_k$.

We shall use the following consequence of the Petersson trace formula which follows from Lemma 2.1 of [15].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $k$ be a large even integer, and $n$ be a positive integer such that $n \leq k^2/10^4$. Then, we have*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\lambda_f(n) = \delta(n) + O\left(k^{-5/6}\right), \tag{3.3}$$

*where $\delta(n) = 1$ if $n = 1$, and is $0$ otherwise.*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma Lemma 2.1 of [15] that

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\lambda_f(n) = \delta(n) + O\left(e^{-k}\right).$$

The result follows from combining this estimate with (3.1). □

The formula (3.3) can be interpreted as follows: Recall that $G^\natural$ is the set of conjugacy classes of $G = SU(2)$ endowed with the Sato-Tate measure $\mu_{st}$ (the direct image of the Haar measure $\mu_G$ by the canonical projection). Let $n > 1$ and $n = p_1^{a_1}\cdots p_\ell^{a_\ell}$ be its prime factorization. Then we have the identity

$$\lambda_f(n) = \lambda_f(p_1^{a_1})\cdots\lambda_f(p_\ell^{a_\ell}) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{Sym}^{a_1}\left(g_f(p_1)\right)\right)\cdots\operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{Sym}^{a_\ell}\left(g_f(p_\ell)\right)\right), \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$g_f(p) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_f(p)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta_f(p)}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Fix now the primes $p_1,\dots,p_\ell$. By the identity (3.4) together with the Peter-Weyl Theorem and Weyl's equidistribution criterion, the estimate (3.3) applied to integers $n$ divisible only by the primes in $\{p_1,\dots,p_\ell\}$ yields the equidistribution of the $\ell$-tuple of conjugacy classes $\{g_f^\natural(p_1),\dots,g_f^\natural(p_\ell)\}_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}$ (appropriately weighted by $\omega_f$) into the product of $\ell$ copies of $G^\natural$, as $k\to\infty$. Based on this equidistribution result, we construct a probabilistic random model for the Hecke eigenvalues $\lambda_f(n)$ as follows: let $\{g_p^\natural\}_{p \text{ prime}}$

be a sequence of independent random variables, with values in $G^\natural$ and distributed according to the measure $\mu_{st}$. We define $\mathbb{X}(1) = 1$ and for $n > 1$

$$\mathbb{X}(n) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{a_1}(g_{p_1}^\natural)\right) \cdots \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{a_\ell}(g_{p_\ell}^\natural)\right),$$

if $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_\ell^{a_\ell}$ is the prime factorization of $n$. Furthermore, one can easily check that the $\mathbb{X}(n)$ satisfy the Hecke relations (1.1), namely that

$$\mathbb{X}(m)\mathbb{X}(n) = \sum_{d|(m,n)} \mathbb{X}\left(\frac{mn}{d^2}\right).$$

We prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $n$ be a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{X}(n)) = \delta(n).$$

*Proof.* Let $n > 1$, and write the prime factorization of $n$ as $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdots p_\ell^{a_\ell}$. First, by the independence of the random variables $g_p^\natural$ for different primes $p$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{X}(n)) = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{a_j}(g_{p_j}^\natural)\right)\right).$$

By Weyl's integration formula, the map

$$\theta \to g^\natural(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix}^\natural,$$

identifies $G^\natural$ with the interval $[0, \pi]$ and $\mu_{st}$ with the distribution $d\mu_{st}(t) := \frac{2}{\pi}\sin^2(t)dt$. Furthermore, note that

$$\mathrm{Sym}^a\left(g^\natural(\theta)\right) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{ia\theta} & & & \\ & e^{i(a-2)\theta} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & e^{-ia\theta} \end{pmatrix}^\natural,$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^a\left(g^\natural(\theta)\right)\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{a} e^{i(a-2j)\theta} = \frac{\sin((a+1)\theta)}{\sin\theta}.$$

Therefore, for a prime $p$ and a positive integer $a$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{X}(p^a)) = \frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^\pi \frac{\sin((a+1)\theta)}{\sin\theta}\sin^2\theta d\theta = 0,$$

since the functions $\{Y_n\}_{n\geq 0}$, defined by

$$Y_n(t) := \frac{\sin((n+1)t)}{\sin t}$$

form an orthonormal basis of $L^2([0,\pi], d\mu_{st})$. This completes the proof. □

Using Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 we prove that in a certain range of $x$, the harmonic moments of $S_f(x)$ (as $f$ varies in $\mathcal{H}_k$) are very close to the moments of the sum of random variables $\sum_{n\le x}\mathbb{X}(n)$.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let $k$ be a large even integer. Let $x\ge 2$ and $\ell$ be a positive integer such that $x^{6\ell}\le k$. Then, we have*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\left|\sum_{n\le x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell}=\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\le x}\mathbb{X}(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right)+O\left(k^{-1/3}\right).$$

In order to prove this proposition, we need to understand the combinatorics of the Hecke relations (1.1). These relations can be written as

$$\lambda_f(n_1)\lambda_f(n_2)=\sum_{m|n_1n_2}b_m(n_1,n_2)\lambda_f(m),$$

where $b_m(n_1,n_2)=1$ if $m=n_1n_2/d^2$ for some $d|(n_1,n_2)$, and equals 0 otherwise. More generally, one can write

$$\lambda_f(n_1)\cdots\lambda_f(n_r)=\sum_{m|\prod_{j=1}^r n_j}b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)\lambda_f(m), \tag{3.5}$$

for some integers $b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)$. These coefficients have a nice interpretation in terms of the representation theory of $G=SU(2)$. The irreducible characters of $G$ are

$$g\to\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^a(g)\right),$$

for $a\ge 0$. Hence, for $n=p_1^{a_1}\cdots p_\ell^{a_\ell}$, the character

$$\chi_n(g_{p_1},\dots,g_{p_\ell})=\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{a_1}\left(g_{p_1}\right)\right)\cdots\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^{a_\ell}\left(g_{p_\ell}\right)\right)$$

is an irreducible character of the product of $\ell$ copies of $G$, and the formula

$$\chi_{n_1}\cdots\chi_{n_r}=\sum_{m|\prod_{j=1}^r n_j}b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)\chi_m$$

is the decomposition formula for the product of the $r$ characters $\chi_{n_1},\dots,\chi_{n_r}$ in terms of the irreducibles $\chi_m$. In particular, the coefficients $b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)$ are non-negative, and we also have

$$\mathbb{X}(n_1)\cdots\mathbb{X}(n_r)=\sum_{m|\prod_{j=1}^r n_j}b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)\mathbb{X}(m). \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover, one can easily prove (either by induction on $r$ or by exploiting the representation theory of $SU(2)$) that

$$b_m(n_1,\dots,n_r)\le\tau(n_1)\cdots\tau(n_r). \tag{3.7}$$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let $g$ be a real-valued arithmetic function. For all $x \geq 2$ and positive integers $\ell$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\mathbb{X}(n)g(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) = \sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x} b_1(n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell})g(n_1)g(n_2)\cdots g(n_{2\ell}).$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\mathbb{X}(n)g(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x}\mathbb{X}(n_1)\mathbb{X}(n_2)\cdots\mathbb{X}(n_{2\ell})g(n_1)g(n_2)\cdots g(n_{2\ell})\right)\\ &= \sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x} g(n_1)g(n_2)\cdots g(n_{2\ell})\mathbb{E}\big(\mathbb{X}(n_1)\mathbb{X}(n_2)\cdots\mathbb{X}(n_{2\ell})\big).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.6) that

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\mathbb{X}(n_1)\mathbb{X}(n_2)\cdots\mathbb{X}(n_{2\ell})\big) = \sum_{m|n_1n_2\cdots n_{2\ell}} b_m(n_1,n_2,\dots,n_{2\ell})\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{X}(m)) = b_1(n_1,n_2,\dots,n_{2\ell}),$$

by Lemma 3.2. This completes the proof. □

We deduce the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let $g$ and $h$ be arithmetic functions such that $g(n)\geq h(n)\geq 0$ for all $n\geq 1$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\mathbb{X}(n)g(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) \geq \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\mathbb{X}(n)h(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right).$$

We are now ready to prove Proposition 3.3.

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.* By (3.5) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x}\lambda_f(n_1)\cdots\lambda_f(n_{2\ell})\\ &= \sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x}\sum_{m|n_1\cdots n_{2\ell}} b_m(n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell})\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\lambda_f(m).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}^{h}\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} &= \sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x} b_1(n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell})\\ &\quad + O\left(k^{-5/6}\sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\leq x}\sum_{m|n_1\cdots n_{2\ell}} b_m(n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell})\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, using that $b_m(n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}) \le \tau(n_1)\cdots\tau(n_{2\ell})$ we deduce that the error term above is

$$\ll k^{-5/6} \sum_{n_1,\dots,n_{2\ell}\le x} \tau(n_1)\cdots\tau(n_{2\ell})\tau(n_1\cdots n_{2\ell}) \ll_\varepsilon x^{2\ell\varepsilon}k^{-5/6}\left(\sum_{n\le x}\tau(n)\right)^{2\ell} \ll k^{-1/3}.$$

using the bound $\tau(n_1\cdots n_{2\ell}) \ll_\varepsilon (n_1\cdots n_{2\ell})^\varepsilon \le x^{2\ell\varepsilon}$ together with the estimate $\sum_{n\le x}\tau(n) \ll x\log x$. Appealing to Lemma 3.4 completes the proof. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 we need to derive lower bounds for the moments of $\sum_{n\le x}\mathbb{X}(n)$. We establish the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let $\ell \ge 2$ be an integer. Then, for all real numbers $2 \le y \le x$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\le x}\mathbb{X}(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) \ge \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\exp\left(-10\frac{y\log\log x}{\log y} + O\left(\frac{\ell}{\log x}\right)\right).$$

*Proof.* First, by Corollary 3.5 with $g(n)=1$ and $h(n)$ being the characteristic function of the $y$-friable numbers, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{n\le x}\mathbb{X}(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) \ge \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{\substack{n\le x\\ P(n)\le y}}\mathbb{X}(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right). \tag{3.8}$$

For a prime $p$, write

$$g_p^\natural = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta_p} & 0\\ 0 & e^{-i\theta_p}\end{pmatrix}^\natural,$$

where $\theta_p$ is a random variable taking values in $[0,\pi]$ and distributed according to the Sato-Tate distribution $d\mu_{st}(t) := \frac{2}{\pi}\sin^2(t)dt$ . Let $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X})$ be the event corresponding to

$$|\theta_p| \le \frac{1}{(\log x)^2}, \text{ for all primes } p \le y.$$

By the independence of the $\theta_p$ for different primes $p$, we deduce that the probability of $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X})$ is

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X})) = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\int_0^{(\log x)^{-2}}\sin^2 t dt\right)^{\pi(y)} \ge \left(\frac{c}{(\log x)^6}\right)^{\pi(y)} \gg \exp\left(-10\frac{y\log\log x}{\log y}\right),$$

for some positive constant $c$. On the other hand, one can see that for any prime $p\le y$ and all outcomes in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X})$, we have

$$\mathbb{X}(p^a) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{Sym}^a g_p^\natural) = \frac{\sin((a+1)\theta_p)}{\sin\theta_p} = (a+1)\left(1+O\left(a^2\theta_p^2\right)\right) = \tau(p^a)\left(1+O\left(\frac{a^2}{(\log x)^4}\right)\right).$$

Therefore, if $n \leq x$ and $P(n) \leq y$ then for all outcomes in $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X})$ we have

$$\mathbb{X}(n) = \tau(n)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\omega(n)}{(\log x)^2}\right)\right) = \tau(n)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right)\right),$$

where $\omega(n)$ is the number of distinct prime factors of $n$, which satisfies $\omega(n) \ll \log x$. Thus, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{\substack{n\leq x\\ P(n)\leq y}} \mathbb{X}(n)\right|^{2\ell}\right) &\geq \left(\sum_{\substack{n\leq x\\ P(n)\leq y}} \tau(n)\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right)\right)\right)^{2\ell} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{X}))\\ &\gg \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell} \exp\left(-10\frac{y\log\log x}{\log y} + O\left(\frac{\ell}{\log x}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

We finish this section by proving Theorem 1.5, and deducing Corollary 1.4.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* Let $\ell = [\log k/(6\log x)]$. Then, it follows from Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_k|_h}\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}\omega_f\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} &\geq \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\exp\left(-10\frac{y\log\log x}{\log y} + O\left(\frac{\ell}{\log x}\right)\right) + O\left(k^{-1/3}\right)\\ &\geq \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\exp\left(-15\frac{\log k\log\log\log k}{(\log\log k)^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in view of (3.1) and (3.2) we obtain

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k}\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} \geq \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\cdot k\exp\left(-20\frac{\log k\log\log\log k}{(\log\log k)^2}\right). \tag{3.9}$$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of Hecke cusp forms $f \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that

$$\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right| \geq \Psi(x,y;\tau)\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log\log k}}\right).$$

Since $|\mathcal{H}_k| \asymp k$ we obtain

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{H}_k\setminus\mathcal{B}}\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} \leq \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\cdot k\exp\left(-\frac{\log k}{10A(\log\log k)^{3/2}}\right).$$

Combining this bound with (3.9) we get

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{B}}\left|\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} \gg \Psi(x,y;\tau)^{2\ell}\cdot k\exp\left(-20\frac{\log k\log\log\log k}{(\log\log k)^2}\right). \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\sum_{f\in\mathcal{B}}\left|\sum_{n\le x}\lambda_f(n)\right|^{2\ell} \le |\mathcal{B}|\left(\sum_{n\le x}\tau(n)\right)^{2\ell}.$$

Moreover, by (1.7) we have

$$\Psi(x,y;\tau) \ge \Psi(x,x^{1/(2A)};\tau) \gg_A \sum_{n\le x}\tau(n). \tag{3.11}$$

Hence, we derive from (3.10) that

$$|\mathcal{B}| \ge k\exp\left(-20\frac{\log k\log\log\log k}{(\log\log k)^2}+O_A\left(\frac{\log k}{\log\log k}\right)\right),$$

which completes the proof. □

*Proof of Corollary 1.4.* The result follows from Theorem 1.5 together with Eq. (3.11). □

## 4. Cancellations under GRH: proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.2

Let $f\in\mathcal{H}_k$. For $\mathrm{Re}(s)>1$ we have

$$\log L(s,f)=\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}\frac{\Lambda(n)b_f(n)}{n^s\log n},$$

where $b_f(n)=(e^{i\theta_f(p)})^a+(e^{-i\theta_f(p)})^a$ if $n=p^a$ for some prime $p$, and equals 0 otherwise. For $y\ge 1$ we define

$$L_y(s,f)=\sum_{P(n)\le y}\frac{\lambda_f(n)}{n^s}=\prod_{p\le y}\left(1-\frac{e^{i\theta_f(p)}}{p^s}\right)^{-1}\left(1-\frac{e^{-i\theta_f(p)}}{p^s}\right)^{-1}.$$

In order to approximate $S_f(x)$ by $\Psi(x,y;\lambda_f)$, we shall prove that conditionally on GRH, $\log L(s,f)$ is very well approximated by $\log L_y(s,f)$ for $\mathrm{Re}(s)\ge 1$. This will be the key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $f\in\mathcal{H}_k$ and assume GRH for $L(s,f)$. Let $2\le y\le k$, and $s=\sigma+it$ with $\sigma\ge 1$ and $|t|\le 2k$. Then, we have*

$$\log L(s,f)-\log L_y(s,f)\ll\frac{(\log y)^2\log k}{\sqrt{y}}.$$

To prove this result we need the following standard bound.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $f\in\mathcal{H}_k$. Let $s=\sigma+it$ with $1/2<\sigma\le 3/2$ and $|t|\le 3k$. Let $1/2\le\sigma_0<\sigma$, and suppose that there are no zeros of $L(z,f)$ inside the rectangle $\{z:\sigma_0\le\mathrm{Re}(z)\le 1,|\mathrm{Im}(z)-t|\le 3\}$. Then, we have*

$$\log L(s,f)\ll\frac{\log k}{\sigma-\sigma_0}.$$

*Proof.* Consider the circles with centre $2+it$ and radii $r = 2-\sigma$ and $R = 2-\sigma_0$, so that the smaller circle passes through $s$. By our assumption, $\log L(z,f)$ is analytic inside the larger circle. For a point $z$ on the larger circle, it follows from the standard convexity bound for $L(s,f)$ that $\mathrm{Re}\log L(z,f) \ll \log k$. Finally, using the Borel-Caratheodory theorem we obtain

$$\log L(s,f) \leq \frac{2r}{R-r}\max_{|z-2-it|=R}\mathrm{Re}\log L(z,f) + \frac{R+r}{R-r}|\log L(2+it,f)| \ll \frac{\log k}{\sigma-\sigma_0}.$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Let $c_1 = 1-\sigma+1/\log y$. Then it follows from Perron's formula (see [3]) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c_1-iy}^{c_1+iy}\log L(s+z,f)\frac{y^z}{z}dz &= \sum_{n\leq y}\frac{\Lambda(n)b_f(n)}{n^s\log n} + O\left(y^{c_1}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^{\sigma+c_1}}\min\left(1,\frac{1}{y\log|y/n|}\right)\right)\\ &= \sum_{n\leq y}\frac{\Lambda(n)b_f(n)}{n^s\log n} + O\left(y^{-\sigma}\log y\right),\end{aligned}$$

by a standard estimation of the error term. We now move the contour to the line $\mathrm{Re}(s) = c_2$ where $c_2 = 1/2-\sigma+1/\log y$. By our assumption, we only encounter a simple pole at $z=0$ that leaves a residue of $\log L(s,f)$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 4.2 with $\sigma_0 = 1/2$ that

$$\log L(s+z,f) \ll \log k\log y,$$

uniformly for $z$ with $\mathrm{Re}(z)\geq c_2$ and $|\mathrm{Im}(z)|\leq y$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c_1-iy}^{c_1+iy}\log L(s+z,f)\frac{y^z}{z}dz = \log L(s,f)+\mathcal{E},$$

where

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(\int_{c_1-iy}^{c_2-iy}+\int_{c_2-iy}^{c_2+iy}+\int_{c_2+iy}^{c_1+iy}\right)\log L(s+z,f)\frac{y^z}{z}dz \ll \frac{(\log y)^2\log k}{y^{1/2-\sigma}}.$$

The result follows upon noting that

$$\log L_y(s,f) - \sum_{n\leq y}\frac{\Lambda(n)b_f(n)}{n^s\log n} = \sum_{\substack{p\leq y\\ p^a>y}}\frac{(e^{i\theta_f(p)})^a+(e^{-i\theta_f(p)})^a}{ap^{as}} \ll \sum_{\substack{p\leq y\\ p^a>y}}\frac{1}{ap^{2a}} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}.$$

□

We now prove Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* Without loss of generality assume that $x \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$. Let $c = 1 + 1/\log x$. By Perron's formula together with (1.2) we have

$$\sum_{n\leq x} \lambda_f(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-ix}^{c+ix} L(s,f)\frac{x^s}{s}ds + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^c}{n^c}\frac{\tau(n)}{|\log(x/n)|}\right).$$

The error term above is

$$\begin{aligned}&\ll \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{\tau(n)}{n^{1+1/\log x}} + \sum_{x/2<n<2x}\frac{\tau(n)}{n|\log(x/n)|}\\ &\ll_\varepsilon \zeta(1+1/\log x)^2 + x^{\varepsilon/2}\sum_{r\leq x}\frac{1}{r} \ll_\varepsilon x^\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\Psi(x,y;\lambda_f) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-ix}^{c+ix} L_y(s,f)\frac{x^s}{s}ds + O_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon).$$

Define

$$R_y(s,f) := \frac{L(s,f)}{L_y(s,f)}.$$

Then, combining the above estimates we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\leq x}\lambda_f(n) - \Psi(x,y;\lambda_f) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-ix}^{c+ix}\left(L(s,f) - L_y(s,f)\right)\frac{x^s}{s}ds + O_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon)\\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-ix}^{c+ix} L_y(s,f)\big(\exp(\log R_y(s,f)) - 1\big)\frac{x^s}{s}ds + O_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using Lemma 4.1 we obtain

$$\exp(\log R_y(s,f)) = 1 + O\left(\frac{(\log y)^2\log q}{\sqrt{y}}\right),$$

for all $s$ with $\mathrm{Re}(s) = c$ and $|\mathrm{Im}(s)| \leq x$. Furthermore, note that for $\mathrm{Re}(s) = c$ we have

$$L_y(s,f) = \exp\left(\sum_{p\leq y}\frac{\lambda_f(p)}{p^s} + O(1)\right) \ll (\log y)^2,$$

since $\lambda_f(p) \leq 2$. Combining these estimates, we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{c-ix}^{c+ix} L_y(s,f)\big(\exp(\log R_y(s,f)) - 1\big)\frac{x^s}{s}ds \ll \frac{x(\log x)(\log y)^4\log q}{\sqrt{y}},$$

which completes the proof.

□

In order to deduce Corollary 1.2, we need to prove the bound (1.9), which shows that $\Psi(x,y;\tau) = o(x\log x)$ when $u = \log x/\log y \to \infty$.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let $10 \leq y \leq x$ be real numbers. Then we have*

$$\Psi(x, y; \tau) \ll e^{-u/2} x \log x.$$

*Proof.* Let $\beta = 2/(3 \log y)$. Then, observe that

$$\Psi(x, y; \tau) \leq \sum_{n \leq x^{3/4}} \tau(n) + x^{-3\beta/4} \sum_{\substack{x^{3/4} \leq n \leq x \\ P(n) \leq y}} n^{\beta} \tau(n) \ll x^{3/4} \log x + e^{-u/2} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P(n) \leq y}} n^{\beta} \tau(n).$$

Let

$$g(n) = \begin{cases} n^{\beta} \tau(n) & \text{if } P(n) \leq y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $g$ is multiplicative, and for all primes $p \leq y$ we have $g(p^a) = (a+1)p^{a\beta} \ll (1.9)^a$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.5.1 of [17] we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P(n) \leq y}} n^{\beta} \tau(n) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \prod_{p \leq y} \left( \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \frac{g(p^a)}{p^a} \right) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \prod_{p \leq y} \left( 1 + \frac{2p^{\beta}}{p} \right).$$

The result follows upon noting that $x^{3/4} \ll x e^{-u/2}$ for $y \geq 10$ and

$$\prod_{p \leq y} \left( 1 + \frac{2p^{\beta}}{p} \right) \ll \exp \left( 2 \sum_{p \leq y} \frac{1 + O(\beta \log p)}{p} \right) \ll (\log y)^2.$$

□

*Proof of Corollary 1.2.* The result holds trivially for $x > k$ by (1.6), so we may assume that $x \leq k$. Then, using Theorem 1.3 with $y = (\log k)^3$, together with Lemma 4.3 and our assumption on $x$ completes the proof. □

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Emmanuel Kowalski for useful comments concerning the probabilistic random model for the Hecke eigenvalues in Section 3.

## References

[1] N. G. de Bruijn, J. H. van Lint, *Incomplete sums of multiplicative functions, I, II.* Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. (A) 67 (1966), 339–347; 348–359.

[2] J. Cogdell, P. Michel, *On the complex moments of symmetric power L-functions at $s = 1$*, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2004, no. 31, 1561–1617.

[3] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative number theory.* Third edition. Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 74. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000. xiv+177 pp.

[4] A. Granville and K. Soundararajan, *Large character sums*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 14 (2001), no. 2, 365–397.

[5] D. Hensley, *The convolution powers of the Dickman function.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) 33 (1986), no. 3, 395–406.

[6] A. Hildebrand, *Quantitative mean value theorems for nonnegative multiplicative functions. II.* Acta Arith. 48 (1987), no. 3, 209–260.

[7] J. Hoffstein, P. Lockhart, *Coefficients of Maass forms and the Siegel zero.* With an appendix by D. Goldfeld, J. Hoffstein and D. Lieman. Ann. of Math. (2) 140 (1994), no. 1, 161–181.

[8] H. Iwaniec, E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory.* American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. xii+615 pp.

[9] E. Kowalski, Y.-K. Lau, K. Soundararajan, J. Wu, *On modular signs.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 149 (2010), no. 3, 389–411.

[10] Y.-K. Lau, E. Royer, J. Wu, *Twisted moments of automorphic L-functions.* J. Number Theory 130 (2010), no. 12, 2773–2802.

[11] J. Liu, E. Royer, J. Wu, *On a conjecture of Montgomery-Vaughan on extreme values of automorphic L-functions at* 1. Anatomy of integers, 217–245, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 46, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.

[12] K. Matomäki, *On signs of Fourier coefficients of cusp forms.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 152 (2012), no. 2, 207–222.

[13] P. Michel, A, Venkatesh, *The subconvexity problem for $GL_2$.* Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes tudes Sci. No. 111 (2010), 171–271.

[14] H. L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan, *Exponential Sums with Multiplicative Functions.* Invent. Math. 43 (1977), 69–82.

[15] Z. Rudnick, K. Soundararajan, *Lower bounds for moments of L-functions: symplectic and orthogonal examples.* Multiple Dirichlet series, automorphic forms, and analytic number theory, 293–303, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 75, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

[16] H. Smida, *Valeur moyenne des fonctions de Piltz sur les entiers sans grand facteur premier.* Acta Arith. 63 (1993), no. 1, 21–50.

[17] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 46. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. xvi+448 pp.

[18] G. Tenenbaum, J. Wu, *Moyennes de certaines fonctions multiplicatives sur les entiers friables.* J. Reine Angew. Math. 564 (2003), 119–166.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto, ON, M3J1P3 Canada

*E-mail address*: lamzouri@mathstat.yorku.ca